

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA (Scranton)

JANE DOE, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SCHUYLKILL COUNTY  
COURTHOUSE, et al.,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION – LAW

No. 3:21-cv-00477-DFB

MAGISTRATE JUDGE DARYL F.  
BLOOM

*Electronically Filed*

**Jury Trial Demanded**

**RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS’ MOTION IN LIMINE TO  
PRECLUDE EVIDENCE PERTAINING TO DOE 2’S  
PRIOR EMPLOYMENT**

AND NOW, come Defendants, SCHUYLKILL COUNTY, GARY BENDER, and HEIDI ZULA, by and through their undersigned counsel, JonesPassodelis, PLLC, and file the within Response in Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion in Limine to Preclude Evidence Pertaining to Doe 2’s Prior Employment, averring as follows:

1. Plaintiffs’ Motion in Limine to Preclude Evidence Pertaining to Doe 2’s Prior Employment (ECF No. 347) seeks to exclude evidence regarding an investigation conducted by and request to resign by the prior employer, PrimeCare, of Doe 2.

2. Doe 2 worked as a Health Services Administrator (“HSA”) with PrimeCare “immediately prior” to her employment with the County. PrimeCare is

contracted with the County to provide medical services to the County Jail. Doe 2 worked as the HSA at the Schuylkill County Jail. While Doe served as HSA, it was discovered that medication was being improperly prescribed by PrimeCare nurses to correctional officers. Investigations ensued, including one conducted by the Schuylkill County Jail Warden and one by PrimeCare. PrimeCare determined that Doe 2 failed to perform her duties as a supervisor. She was asked by PrimeCare to resign, in lieu of termination. (Ex. A (Deposition of Doe 2 on 1/23/2023) at p. 10).

3. Plaintiffs' Motion to Exclude Evidence on this point conveniently ignores the relevance of such information which Plaintiffs themselves have brought to the forefront of this litigation. To the extent this evidence will be used to respond to specific allegations and theories raised by Plaintiffs and given the high probative value of such evidence of County-related employment, Plaintiffs' Motion is appropriately denied.

4. Indeed, Doe 2 alleged that there were untrue rumors about her using drugs. (Ex. A at p. 15). Plaintiff herself attributed those rumors about her to the allegations raised against her by PrimeCare. (Ex. A at pp. 11-14). To the extent Plaintiffs put such averments at issue, Defendants are entitled to introduce evidence to contradict the same. *Lyons v. Freeman Decorating Servs., Inc.*, 2009 WL 10697507, at \*4-5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 23, 2009).

5. Further, Plaintiffs produced an expert report on behalf of Doe 2 which consists of a psychological evaluation in which a psychologist conducted a clinical interview of Doe 2 and made conclusions regarding Doe 2's mental diagnoses and the causes of the same. In that report, based upon the statements of Doe 2, the psychologist recalled Doe 2's occupation history to include her employment at PrimeCare and a report Doe 2 made that she left the position on good terms because she was unhappy with the schedule and working with inmates.

6. This is contrary to Doe 2's deposition testimony under oath that she was asked to resign because she failed to perform her job duties. Certainly, Defendants should be entitled to raise such inconsistency at trial including as to the validity of the psychologist's conclusions as raised by Plaintiffs.

7. The evidence is also admissible to address Doe 2's credibility pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 608 especially in light of the contradicting statements. *Smith v. Specialty Pool Contractors*, 2009 WL 799748, at \* 2 (W.D. Pa. Mar. 25, 2009).

WHEREFORE, Defendants, SCHUYLKILL COUNTY, GARY BENDER, and HEIDI ZULA, respectfully request that this Honorable Court deny Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine to Preclude Evidence Pertaining to Doe 2's Prior Employment for the reasons set forth herein.

Respectfully submitted,

JONESPASSODELIS, PLLC

By: s/Marie Milie Jones

MARIE MILIE JONES, Esquire

PA I.D. #49711

E-Mail: [mjones@jonespassodelis.com](mailto:mjones@jonespassodelis.com)

MARIA N. PIPAK, Esquire

PA I.D. #317450

E-Mail: [mpipak@jonespassodelis.com](mailto:mpipak@jonespassodelis.com)

MICHAEL R. LETTRICH, Esquire

PA I.D. #80635

E-Mail: [mletrich@jonespassodelis.com](mailto:mletrich@jonespassodelis.com)

Fifth Avenue Place

120 Fifth Avenue, Suite 26300

Pittsburgh, PA 15222

Phone: (412) 315-7272

Fax: (412) 315-7273

Counsel for Defendants,

SCHUYLKILL COUNTY, GARY BENDER  
and HEIDI ZULA

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that the foregoing document was served upon the following counsel of record via ECF:

Catherine W. Lowry, Esquire  
Derek Smith Law Group, PLLC  
1628 Pine Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
[catherine@dereksmithlaw.com](mailto:catherine@dereksmithlaw.com)  
*Counsel for Plaintiffs*

Paul Gregory Lees, Esquire  
Dickie, McCamey & Chilcote, P.C.  
190 Brodhead Road, Suite 310  
Bethlehem, PA 18017  
[plees@dmclaw.com](mailto:plees@dmclaw.com)  
*Counsel for Defendant, Doreen Kutzler*

Gerard J. Geiger, Esquire  
Newman Williams  
712 Monroe Street  
Stroudsburg, PA 18360  
[ggeiger@newmanwilliams.com](mailto:ggeiger@newmanwilliams.com)  
*Counsel for Defendant, George Halcovage*

Meghan Wynkoop, Esquire  
Anastasia Shubert-Baranowski, Esquire  
Margolis Edelstein  
170 S. Independence Mall W., Suite 400E  
Philadelphia, PA 19106-3337  
[mwynkoop@margolisedelstein.com](mailto:mwynkoop@margolisedelstein.com)  
[abaranowski@margolisedelstein.com](mailto:abaranowski@margolisedelstein.com)  
*Counsel for Defendant, Glenn Roth*

JONESPASSODELIS, PLLC

Date: December 17, 2024

s/Marie Milie Jones  
MARIE MILIE JONES, Esquire  
MARIA N. PIPAK, Esquire  
MICHAEL R. LETTRICH, Esquire

Counsel for Defendants,  
SCHUYLKILL COUNTY, GARY BENDER  
and HEIDI ZULA